

Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and Dynamical Dark Energy

Michael Doran,^{*} Steffen Stern,[†] and Eduard Thommes[‡]
Institut für Theoretische Physik, Philosophenweg 16, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany

We compute the impact of dark energy at last scattering on measurements of baryon acoustic oscillations (BAOs). We show that an early dark energy component can contribute a systematic uncertainty to BAO measurements of up to 2.5%. Whilst this effect turns out to only slightly affect current BAO surveys, the results of future BAO surveys might become biased. We find that BAO surveys alone appear unable to resolve this systematic uncertainty, so supplementary measurements are necessary.

INTRODUCTION

Current observations [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] suggest that roughly 70% of our Universe consists of dark energy. It seems rather peculiar that in the current Universe, dark matter and dark energy contribute roughly equally towards the total energy density. While cosmological constant models so far fail to address this issue, dynamical dark energy models [7, 8, 9] might offer an explanation. If the fractional energy density $\Omega_d(a)$ of dark energy evolved within one or two orders of magnitude similar to that of dark matter, it comes less to a surprise that this is also the case today. In terms of (effective [10]) scalar field models, this can e.g. be achieved using exponential potentials or couplings between dark energy and dark matter. Typically, such models contribute $\Omega_d^e < 5\%$ towards the energy density at early times $z \gtrsim 10$ [11, 12, 13].

An important feature of such dark energy models is the change of cosmological distances, including the sound horizon at last scattering [14]. In this paper, we will therefore extend the analysis of [15] concerning the baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) to the case of early dark energy models. The importance of BAO measurements as a probe of dark energy has for example been pointed out in [16, 17]. Furthermore, the BAO data extracted from the SDSS luminous red galaxy survey [15] was used to constrain parameterizations of dynamical dark energy models [18, 19, 20, 21], where it supplemented Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) and Supernovae Ia (Sne Ia) measurements.

BARYON ACOUSTIC OSCILLATIONS

The acoustic oscillations of baryons and photons in the primeval plasma lead to pronounced peaks in the multipole spectrum of the CMB. At last scattering, the pattern of over and under densities in the baryon fluid remains roughly speaking imprinted on scales of the sound horizon at decoupling. In particular, baryonic oscillations leave an imprint on the matter power spectrum. In [15] Eisenstein et al. report the detection of acoustic oscillations in the redshift-space correlation function of the SDSS LRG sample. Starting with a fiducial cosmology of

$\Omega_m = 0.3$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$ and $h = 0.7$, they obtain constraints on $\Omega_m h^2$ and $D_V(0.35)$ by fitting numerical simulations to the observed spectrum. $D_V(0.35)$ is the distance to $z = 0.35$,

$$D_V(z) \equiv \left[D_M(z)^2 \frac{cz}{H(z)} \right]^{1/3} \quad (1)$$

which is chosen such that it correctly accounts for the Alcock-Paczynski effect [22]. This effect states that the comoving angular diameter distance, $D_M(z)$, and the radial distance vary differently with cosmology. Generally speaking, a homogeneous quantity (like D_V) which is derived from an observed three-dimensional Galaxy distribution has to be defined such that it incorporates quantities which vary like angular and radial distance measures in the correct relative power, i.e. it has to be quadratic in angular and linear in radial distance measures.

The two measured quantities $\Omega_m h^2$ and $D_V(0.35)$ can be combined to a single parameter (A) which Eisenstein et al. measure as [15]¹

$$A \equiv D_V(z = 0.35) \frac{\sqrt{\Omega_m H_0^2}}{0.35c} = 0.469 \pm 0.017. \quad (2)$$

The advantage of using the A -parameter is its explicit dependence on $E(z)$ and Ω_m and its independence of the Hubble constant H_0 , more precisely [15]

$$A = \sqrt{\Omega_m} E(0.35)^{-1/3} \left[\frac{1}{0.35} \int_0^{0.35} \frac{dz}{E(z)} \right]^{2/3}, \quad (3)$$

where $E(z) = H(z)/H_0$. This value in combination with CMB and Sne Ia data was used to constrain the equation of state of dark energy [18, 19, 20, 21], alternative dark energy models [23, 24, 25, 26], as well as neutrinos and extra light particle masses [27, 28].

EFFECTS OF EARLY DARK ENERGY

Since the fraction of early dark energy Ω_d^e is constrained by the CMB and Nucleosynthesis to $\Omega_d^e \lesssim 5\%$

¹ Note that this result is only valid if we are close to the fiducial cosmology $\Omega_m = 0.3$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$.

[11], it suffices to compute the effect of Ω_d^e on A to first order, i.e.

$$\Delta A = \Omega_d^e \frac{\partial A}{\partial \Omega_d^e} \Big|_{\Omega_d^e=0}. \quad (4)$$

The main effect of early dark energy on the BAO measurement is a change of the sound horizon that influences the positions of the acoustic peaks. Assuming a constant early dark energy fraction Ω_d^e , the sound horizon at last scattering is given by the analytic formula [11]

$$r_s = \frac{4\sqrt{1-\Omega_d^e}}{3H_0} \sqrt{\frac{\Omega_\gamma^0}{\Omega_b^0 \Omega_m^0}} \times \ln \frac{\sqrt{1+R_{ls}^{-1}} + \sqrt{R_{ls}^{-1} + R_{equ}^{-1}}}{1 + \sqrt{R_{equ}^{-1}}}. \quad (5)$$

Here, R_{ls} and R_{equ} is the photon to baryon ratio at last scattering and matter-radiation equality respectively, $R = \frac{4}{3} \frac{\rho_\gamma}{\rho_b}$. This result differs only by a factor of $\sqrt{1-\Omega_d^e}$ from that at vanishing Ω_d^e [29]

$$r_s(\Omega_d^e) = r_s(\Omega_d^e = 0) \sqrt{1-\Omega_d^e}. \quad (6)$$

The actual baryonic sound horizon measured in BAO surveys is slightly higher since baryonic waves keep on propagating until the end of the Compton drag epoch, whereas the CMB oscillations already freeze at last scattering [30, 31]. The resulting increase of almost 5% in the BAO sound horizon is, however, independent of early dark energy and can be regarded as a further systematic effect which has to be considered in BAO surveys.

Further note that the sound horizon scale imprinted in the baryon correlation function remains basically unchanged during structure growth [15, 32]. Hence, while early dark energy might shift both r_s and the distance to the last scattering surface and thus might not be fully recognized in a pure CMB measurement [33], BAO provides a direct measure of r_s without possible cancelations, since in typical early dark energy models the late time evolution (between $z = 0$ and $z = 0.35$) is independent of Ω_d^e .

To estimate the importance of the effect of early dark energy we re-examine the BAO measurement performed in [15]. An early dark energy component will basically cause two effects, it will change the scale of the correlation-function and (rather mildly) suppress the small scale power of linear fluctuations [34]. The latter effect mimics to some extent a running spectral index. We assume that this effect is negligible² compared to the

change in the sound horizon. An analysis of the BAO data including a running spectral index could in the future provide an easy way to estimate the magnitude of this second contribution.

Thus, to first order the only effect of early dark energy is a change in the scale of the correlation-function, and this scale is in the Eisenstein treatment [15] 1:1 related to a change in the distance measure D_V ,

$$D_V(z = 0.35, \Omega_d^e) = D_V(z = 0.35, \Omega_d^e = 0) \sqrt{1-\Omega_d^e}. \quad (7)$$

In a simplified model, assuming that all galaxies in the survey are located at the same redshift, the physical explanation for that shift is quite simple. The smaller sound horizon compared to a $\Omega_d^e = 0$ universe leads to a shift in the observed angle of the baryon acoustic oscillations in the matter distribution. In order to observe the oscillations under the same angle on the sky today, our distance to $z = 0.35$ must hence be smaller by a factor of $\sqrt{1-\Omega_d^e}$ to compensate for the shift in r_s .

As $\Omega_m h^2$ is independent of Ω_d^e , early dark energy will to first order only affect D_V according to (7). We therefore get

$$A(\Omega_d^e) = A(\Omega_d^e = 0) \sqrt{1-\Omega_d^e}, \quad (8)$$

and

$$\Delta A = -\frac{1}{2} A \Omega_d^e. \quad (9)$$

As $\Omega_d^e \lesssim 5\%$, early dark energy will systematically reduce the BAO-results D_V and A by up to 2.5%,

$$\frac{|\Delta A|}{A} \approx \frac{|\Delta D_V|}{D_V} \lesssim 2.5\%. \quad (10)$$

In the case of [15], this would mean a change of A due to early dark energy

$$|\Delta A| \lesssim 0.01 \quad (11)$$

resulting in a slightly enhanced uncertainty in A ,

$$A = 0.469 \pm 0.017 \longrightarrow A = 0.469 \pm 0.020 \quad (12)$$

Hence, recent BAO galaxy surveys are just slightly affected by early dark energy.

CONSEQUENCES FOR FUTURE BAO SURVEYS

As also pointed out in [33], early dark energy leads to a miscalibration in BAO measurements which cannot be resolved by BAO measurements alone. While the resulting systematic error of up to 2.5% is small compared to an error in the range of 4–5% for current BAO studies, the accuracy of future BAO surveys might reach an accuracy of 1–2% [35, 36, 37, 38]. Without determining a

² Lacking N-body simulations for an early dark energy universe, we are yet unable to quantify the suppression on small scales.

possible early dark energy component by complementary measurements (CMB, nucleosynthesis), the accuracy of future BAO surveys is hence dominated by the systematic error of early dark energy. If neglected, these surveys will become biased and hence possibly lead to an incorrect determination of cosmological parameters.

DETERMINATION OF EARLY DARK ENERGY WITH BAO SURVEYS

In the preceding sections we have assumed that BAO measurements are used to obtain constraints on late-time cosmological parameters. Adding the early dark energy dependence to BAO at first sight provides us with the possibility to constrain early dark energy with BAO measurements. However, running a Monte Carlo simulation with the WMAP 3-year data [3], Sne Ia [2] and the modified Eisenstein BAO value showed that the bounds on Ω_d^e coming from the CMB are considerably stronger than those coming from BAO: adding the Ω_d^e dependence according to (8) gives no difference to the results obtained in [39]. The picture stays the same when reducing the error of A to 1%, thus indicating that also future BAO surveys need to be supplemented by alternative future measurements which constrain Ω_d^e with a higher precision. For example, the upcoming Planck mission might provide considerably stronger bounds on Ω_d^e .

CONCLUSIONS

Considering impacts of early dark energy to the matter power spectrum, we estimated possible changes to Baryon Acoustic Peak measurements. We found that for the case of Eisenstein et al. these changes are roughly a factor of two smaller than the experimental errors on the A -parameter measured by Eisenstein et al. However, for future BAO surveys the systematic error caused by early dark energy might dominate the results, thus demanding subsidiary determinations of Ω_d^e .

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Georg Robbers for his support with the Monte Carlo simulations.

* Electronic address: M.Doran@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de

† Electronic address: S.Stern@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de

‡ Electronic address: E.Thommles@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de

[1] P. Astier *et al.*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **447**, 31 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0510447].

- [2] A. G. Riess *et al.* [Supernova Search Team Collaboration], *Astrophys. J.* **607**, 665 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0402512].
- [3] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, “Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) three year results: arXiv:astro-ph/0603449.
- [4] A. C. S. Readhead *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **609** (2004) 498 [arXiv:astro-ph/0402359].
- [5] J. H. Goldstein *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **599**, 773 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0212517].
- [6] M. Tegmark *et al.* [SDSS Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. D* **69** (2004) 103501 [arXiv:astro-ph/0310723].
- [7] C. Wetterich, *Nucl. Phys. B* **302**, 668 (1988)
- [8] B. Ratra and P. J. Peebles, *Phys. Rev. D* **37**, 3406 (1988)
- [9] R. R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P. J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 1582 (1998)
- [10] M. Doran and J. Jaeckel, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 043519 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0203018].
- [11] M. Doran and G. Robbers, *JCAP* **0606**, 026 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0601544].
- [12] R. Bean, S. H. Hansen and A. Melchiorri, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 103508 (2001) [arXiv:astro-ph/0104162].
- [13] E. V. Linder, *Astropart. Phys.* **26**, 16 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0603584].
- [14] M. Doran, M. J. Lilley, J. Schwindt and C. Wetterich, *Astrophys. J.* **559**, 501 (2001) [arXiv:astro-ph/0012139].
- [15] D. J. Eisenstein *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **633**, 560 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0501171].
- [16] E. V. Linder, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 083504 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0304001].
- [17] H. J. Seo and D. J. Eisenstein, *Astrophys. J.* **598**, 720 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0307460].
- [18] Y. Wang and P. Mukherjee, *Astrophys. J.* **650**, 1 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0604051].
- [19] J. Dick, L. Knox and M. Chu, *JCAP* **0607**, 001 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0603247].
- [20] Y. g. Gong and Y. Z. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 043518 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0502262].
- [21] K. Ichikawa and T. Takahashi, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 083526 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0511821].
- [22] C. Alcock and B. Paczynski, *Nature* **281**, 358:359 (1979).
- [23] V. F. Cardone, A. Troisi and S. Capozziello, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 043501 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0506371].
- [24] S. Capozziello, V. F. Cardone, E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 043512 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0508350].
- [25] V. F. Cardone, C. Tortora, A. Troisi and S. Capozziello, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 043508 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0511528].
- [26] J. R. Ellis, N. E. Mavromatos, V. A. Mitsou and D. V. Nanopoulos, *Astropart. Phys.* **27**, 185 (2007) [arXiv:astro-ph/0604272].
- [27] M. Cirelli and A. Strumia, *JCAP* **0612**, 013 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0607086].
- [28] J. R. Kristiansen, H. K. Eriksen and O. Elgaroy, arXiv:astro-ph/0608017.
- [29] W. Hu and N. Sugiyama, *Astrophys. J.* **444** (1995) 489 [arXiv:astro-ph/9407093].
- [30] W. Hu and N. Sugiyama, *Astrophys. J.* **471**, 542 (1996) [arXiv:astro-ph/9510117].
- [31] D. J. Eisenstein and W. Hu, *Astrophys. J.* **496**, 605 (1998) [arXiv:astro-ph/9709112].
- [32] H. J. Seo and D. J. Eisenstein, *Astrophys. J.* **633**, 575 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0507338].

- [33] E. V. Linder, arXiv:astro-ph/0610173.
- [34] R. R. Caldwell, M. Doran, C. M. Mueller, G. Schaefer and C. Wetterich, *Astrophys. J.* **591**, L75 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0302505].
- [35] C. Blake and K. Glazebrook, *Astrophys. J.* **594**, 665 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0301632].
- [36] K. Glazebrook and C. Blake, *Astrophys. J.* **631**, 1 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0505608].
- [37] D. J. Eisenstein, H. j. Seo, E. Sirko and D. Spergel, arXiv:astro-ph/0604362.
- [38] E. Huff, A. E. Schulz, M. White, D. J. Schlegel and M. S. Warren, *Astropart. Phys.* **26**, 351 (2007) [arXiv:astro-ph/0607061].
- [39] M. Doran, G. Robbers and C. Wetterich, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 023003 (2007) [arXiv:astro-ph/0609814].